

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated February 4, 2009. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31 and 33-40 are pending. Claims 33 and 35 are allowed. Applicant amends Claims 1, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 34. The amendments to the claims have only been done to expedite the prosecution.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-14, 16-21, 34 and 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Applicants have amended the claims to indicate that the methods are computer implemented. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31 and 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,026 issued to Gillis (hereinafter "*Gillis*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the comments set forth below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, "comparing a semantic vector of an identified document to the semantic vector for each document in the plurality of documents to determine at least one document semantically similar to the identified document." In particular, a semantic vector of a document is compared to a semantic vector for each document in a plurality of documents. Independent claims 14, 23, 24, 26, and 27 recite similar limitations. In contrast, *Gillis* merely teaches comparing term vectors to a target domain to identify semantically distant analogies. ABSTRACT; claim 1. The Office Action fails to cite any passage that teaches or suggest identifying semantically similar documents by comparing semantic vectors for each document. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 14, 23, 24, 26, and 27 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Applicant : Kas Kasravi et al.
Serial No. : 10/766,308
Filed : January 27, 2004
Page : 13 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-0140001 / 50-02-032

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully acknowledge and appreciate the indication by the Examiner that Claims 33 and 35 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account **05-0765 ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORP.**, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 29, 2009

/Michael E. Cox/
Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **26230**
Fish & Richardson P.C.

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107
Fax: (214) 747-2091